EXHIBIT 3

IN THE UNITED STATE FOR THE NORTHERN DIST SAN FRANCISCO	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES,)
INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL) CASE NO. 3:23-MD-03084-CRB
ASSAULT LITIGATION)
SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
COORDINATION PROCEEDINGS)
SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 3.550)) CASE NO. CJC-21-005188
)
In re: Uber Rideshare Cases)
HIGHLY CON	FIDENTIAL
ORAL AND VIDEOTAP	ED DEPOSITION OF
KAYLA W	HALING
February 2	28, 2025

- 1 systems --
- MS. ABRAMS: Objection, nonresponsive.
- 3 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) One of your roles on the Uber
- 4 communications team was to kill stories about dangerous
- 5 drivers, correct?
- 6 MS. RUBIN: Objection, form.
- 7 A. No. I think that's a mischaracterization.
- 8 O. (By Ms. Abrams) Okay. What -- what is
- 9 incorrect about that statement?
- 10 A. We would talk to reporters and provide
- 11 information that -- that we knew for their story and --
- 12 Q. But you would agree that one of your roles at
- 13 Uber was to keep Uber's name out of negative stories in
- 14 the press, correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection, form.
- 16 A. Again, our role was to communicate with
- 17 reporters and address any questions that they had on a
- 18 specific story or case that they were looking at.
- MS. ABRAMS: Objection, nonresponsive.
- 20 O. (By Ms. Abrams) And as part of communicating
- 21 with the press, you'd agree that one of your roles was
- 22 to keep Uber's name out of negative press stories,
- 23 correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- 25 A. Our role is to communicate and address

- 1 each other informed on different stories that we were
- 2 dealing with.
- 3 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) So, at a minimum, Tracey,
- 4 Susan and you would receive these summaries and discuss
- 5 them?
- 6 MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- 7 A. I don't remember discussing them, but I do --
- 8 but we did keep each other informed on stories or
- 9 inquiries that -- that would come in.
- 10 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) Okay. And the purpose of
- 11 killing stories was to keep Uber out of negative press;
- 12 is that correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- 14 A. So some of these terms are just communications
- 15 terms. And so what our role was here, was to work with
- 16 each reporter and explain, also correct accurate [sic]
- 17 information, and -- and keep track of specific inquiries
- 18 that were coming in.
- MR. CUBBERLY: Objection, nonresponsive;
- 20 move to strike.
- 21 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) The purpose of killing stories
- 22 was to keep Uber out of bad press, correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- A. No, I don't agree with that statement. We
- 25 would provide accurate information and push back on

- 1 things that might be inaccurate that the reporter was
- 2 asking about, which you can see in some of the -- the
- 3 work that -- saying that there was incorrect information
- 4 or there was something that happened off platform. And
- 5 so we were providing accurate information back to the
- 6 reporter and then kept track of what the result was.
- 7 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) Okay. Right under Tracey,
- 8 right -- on the West, it says: We killed the story by
- 9 delaying confirmation.
- 10 Do you see that?
- 11 A. I don't know where you are.
- 12 Q. First page, right under Tracey, on the last
- 13 sentence before the bullet points.
- 14 A. I see that written there.
- 15 O. So by delaying confirmation of information,
- 16 that -- when a reporter was reaching out to Uber, the
- 17 story didn't run; it was killed, correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- 19 A. Well, I'm not Tracey.
- 20 Q. (By Ms. Abrams) Okay. Well --
- 21 A. And that wouldn't --
- 22 O. -- you reviewed this, correct?
- MS. RUBIN: Objection to form.
- 24 A. I kept track of my own region.
- Q. (By Ms. Abrams) Did you ever discuss with

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
3	IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES,)
4	INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL) CASE NO. 3:23-MD-03084-CRB
5	ASSAULT LITIGATION)
6	
7	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED JURISDICTION
10	COORDINATION PROCEEDINGS)
11	SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 3.550)) CASE NO. CJC-21-005188
12)
13	In re: Uber Rideshare Cases)
14	
15	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION OF THE
16	ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
17	KAYLA WHALING
18	February 28, 2025
19	I, Jamie K. Israelow, a Certified Shorthand
20	Reporter duly commissioned and qualified in and for the
21	State of Texas, Registered Merit Reporter and Certified
22	Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify to the following:
23	That the witness, KAYLA WHALING, was duly
24	sworn by the officer and that the transcript of the oral
25	deposition is a true record of the testimony given by

```
the witness:
 1
               That the original transcript was delivered to
 2
 3
     Rachel Adams, Esq.
               That a copy of the certificate was served on
 4
     all parties and/or the witness shown herein on
 5
 6
               I further certify that pursuant to FRCP Rule
     30(f)(1) that the signature of the deponent:
 8
 9
               _X_ was requested by the deponent or a party
10
     before the completion of the deposition and that
     signature is to be before any notary public and returned
11
12
     within 30 days from date of receipt of the transcript.
13
     If returned, the attached Changes and Signature Page
14
     contains any changes and the reasons therefor;
15
               was not requested by the deponent or a
16
     party before the completion of the deposition.
17
               I further certify that I am neither attorney
     or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the
18
19
     parties to the action in which this deposition is taken,
20
     and further that I am not a relative or employee of any
     attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, or
21
22
     financially interested in the action.
23
          That the amount of time used by each party at the
24
     deposition is as follows:
               Rachel Adams, Esq. - 6:49
25
               Sara Craig, Esq. - 0:00
```

Case 3:23-md-03084-CRB Document 4686-4 Filed 12/16/25 Page 8 of 8 Kayla Whaling Highly Confidential February 28, 2025

1	Tiffany R. Ellis, Esq. 0:00
2	Beth Wilkins, Esq 0:00 Layne Hilton, Esq. 0:00
3	Walt Cummberly, Esq 0:02 Brian Abramson, Esq 0:00
4	Jacqueline P. Rubin, Esq 0:00
5	That pursuant to information given to the
6	deposition officer at the time said testimony was taken,
7	the following includes counsel for all parties of
8	record:
9	Rachel Adams, Esq., Sara Craig, Esq. and Tiffany R. Ellis, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiffs.
10	Beth Wilkins, Esq., Layne Hilton, Esq. and
11	Steve Rotman, Esq., Attorney for MDL Plaintiffs.
12	Walt Cummberly, Esq. and Brian Abramson, Esq., Attorneys for Defendant MDL AND JCCP PLAINTIFFS.
13	Jacqueline P. Rubin, Esq., and Elizabeth
14	Brandt, Esq., Attorney for Defendants.
15	CERTIFIED TO BY ME on this 13th day of March, 2025.
16	D 6
17	Janie K. Daraelow
18	Jamie K. Israelow, CSR, RMR, CRR Texas CSR 3801
19	Expiration Date: 4/30/2025 US LEGAL SUPPORT, INC.
20	Firm Registration No. 122 16825 Northchase Drive, Suite 900
21	Houston, Texas 77060 713.653.7100
22	
23	
24	
25	
1	